

REMARKS

Claims 25-30 and 41-54 are presented for consideration, with Claims 25, 30, 44, 49, 53 and 54 being independent.

A new abstract is being submitted to better set forth technical aspects of the invention.

Independent Claims 25 and 30 have been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art. In addition, editorial changes have been made to selected claims, and Claims 41-54 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Claims 31-40 have been cancelled.

Claims 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Aschman '578. In addition, Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Aschman in view of Sanger '601 and Kakutani '212. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 of Applicant's invention relates to an image processing apparatus comprised of a first unit for converting primary color data into color data for outputting a dark color material only in a first mode, and a second unit for converting the primary color data into color data for outputting both the dark color material and a light color material in a second mode.

Claim 30 relates to an image processing apparatus for forming an image by using dark color materials and a light color materials. The apparatus includes a first unit for forming an image by using just the dark color material for reproducing primary color data in a first mode, and a second unit for forming an image by using the dark color material and a light

color material having a different color from the dark color material for producing the primary color data in a second mode.

Support for the amendments to Claims 25 and 30 can be found, for example, on page 19, line 11, *et. seq.*, of the specification. In accordance with Applicant's invention, a high performance image processing apparatus can be provided.

The Aschman patent relates to a printing system 10 that includes a carriage 18 and a series of ink jet heads 20 (see Figure 1). The series of print heads includes a first, second, third and fourth set of print heads, with each set having multiple pairs of print heads. With respect to Figure 2, different pairs of print heads (26-2,1; 26-3,1, etc.) deposit different combinations of color inks. Aschman also discloses providing two states, or modes, of operation of the printing system, wherein one to eight layers of ink can be applied in a first mode and one to four layers of ink are applied in a second mode (see column 5, lines 27-38).

In contrast to Claim 25 of Applicant's invention, however, Aschman is not read to teach or suggest a unit for converting primary color data into color data for outputting a dark color material only in a first mode, and a unit for converting the primary color data into color data for outputting both the dark material and a light color material in a second mode. Aschman also fails to teach or suggest a unit for forming an image by using just the dark color material for reproducing primary color data in a first mode, and a unit for forming an image by using the dark color material and a light color material having a different color from the dark color material for reproducing the primary color data in a second mode, as set forth in Claim 30. As discussed above, in Aschman the first and second modes, or states, determine the number of colors (four or eight) to be used in order to create an image.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Aschman fails to anticipate or render obvious Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 25 or 30. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 25, 26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 27, the secondary citation to Sanger relates to a printing apparatus and is relied on for its teaching of a color matching mode, and the secondary citation to Kakutani relates to a printing system and is used for its teaching of a mode for lowering granularity.

Neither secondary citation, however, compensates for the deficiencies in Aschman as discussed above with respect to Claim 25. Accordingly, the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as set forth in Claim 27. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kawamura '701. Without conceding to the propriety of this rejection, Claims 31-40 have been cancelled. This rejection is therefore deemed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Newly submitted Claims 44 and 53 relate to an image processing method and a computer readable medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 25. Newly submitted Claims 49 and 54 relate to an image processing method and a computer readable recording medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 30. These claims are thus submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 25, 30, 44, 49, 53 and 54 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims

26-29, 41-43, 45-48 and 50-52 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention.

Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rrnm

FCHS_WS 2489986v1